

OPINION 2323 (Case 3527)***Anguis jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802 (currently *Typhlops jamaicensis*; Reptilia, Serpentes): specific name conserved**

Abstract. The Commission has conserved the specific names of *Anguis jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802 and *Anguis lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758 for two species of blind snake from the Caribbean in their accustomed usage, by ruling that *Anguis jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802 is not to be treated as a replacement name for *A. lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758 (currently *Typhlops lumbricalis*). A neotype is designated for *A. jamaicensis*.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Reptilia; Serpentes; TYPHLOPIDAE; *Typhlops lumbricalis*; *Typhlops jamaicensis*; blind snakes; West Indies; Bahamas; Cuba; Jamaica.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power the Commission has ruled that the specific name *jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen *Anguis jamaicensis*, is to be treated as the specific name of a newly proposed nominal species and not as a replacement name for *Anguis lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758.
- (2) Specimen KU 269908 at the University of Kansas Natural History Museum & Biodiversity Research Center, Lawrence, KS, U.S.A. is hereby designated as the neotype of *Anguis jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802.
- (3) The name *jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen *Anguis jamaicensis* and as defined by the neotype designated in (2) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3527

An application to conserve the usage of the specific names of *Anguis lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Anguis jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802 for two species of blind snake from the Caribbean, was received from M. Domínguez (*Centro Iberoamericano de la Biodiversidad (CIBIO), Universidad de Alicante, Edificio de Ciencias III, Alicante, Spain*) and R.E. Díaz, Jr. (*University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, U.S.A.*) on 9 June 2010. After correspondence the case was published in BZN **68**: 197–203 (2011). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments were received on that case.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 2013 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN **68**: 201–202.

At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2013 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 23: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – 1: Kojima.

Split votes – 1: Bouchet (FOR – proposals 1 and 3, ABSTAIN – proposal 2). Pyle and Ng were on leave of absence.

Voting FOR, Rosenberg said that an application was not needed in this case as the question mark with the Linnaean reference made it clear that *Anguis jamaicensis* was not a replacement name for *Anguis lumbricalis*. He voted FOR this case, since a neotype was needed. If the Commission designated the neotype under Article 80.2.1 (without use of the plenary power), then there was no need to publish the neotype designation separately elsewhere. He added that, as the comments showed, this ruling must be made under Article 78.2.3 using the specific powers, not Article 78.1 (plenary power). Voting FOR, Grygier explained that it was acceptable to write that ruling (1) was based on use of the plenary power. He explained it as follows: ‘The need for that power depends on how Shaw’s question mark after the name *lumbricalis* is interpreted. If the question mark is considered to represent a doubtful assignment, then no plenary power is needed; but if it is regarded as mere typography transcribed from an earlier work with no import in context, the plenary power is needed. Commissioners may be divided on this point. so it is probably safest to invoke the plenary power’. SPLITTING his vote, Bouchet regretted that the opportunity was missed to select a neotype that was associated with molecular data. Voting AGAINST, Kojima commented that he had not found any reasons why the plenary power was necessary to conserve the specific name *jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen *Anguis jamaicensis*. Regardless of Shaw’s (1802) unstated intention, *jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802 was treated as the specific name of a newly proposed nominal species which Shaw might have considered as a probable synonym of *Anguis lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758. The application did not in his view clearly mention the reason for *jamaicensis* Shaw, 1802 being interpreted as a replacement name for *lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758. He added that the two names had been used as valid and not as synonyms. The authors did not need to request a ruling to designate a neotype for *Anguis lumbricalis* Linnaeus, 1758. Yanega, who voted FOR, said that while the name *jamaicensis* was in common use, it was not demonstrably so well-known that replacing it would be a significant problem if the application were rejected. Nonetheless, it seemed to him that it served the overall goal of stability to continue using this name rather than coining a new one. Voting FOR, Kottelat noted that *Anguis jamaicensis* was not a replacement name for *Anguis lumbricalis*. However, now that the work was done, a neotype should be designated, and the case closed.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

jamaicensis, *Anguis*, Shaw, 1802, *General zoology, or systematic Natural History*, vol. 3 (Amphibia), part 2. vii, Kearsley, London, p. 588.